

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/976,423	10/12/2001	Kirk Hogan	HOGAN-06650	2436
23535 7	10/16/2003		EXAMINER	
MEDLEN & CARROLL, LLP			GOLDBERG, JEANINE ANNE	
101 HOWARD STREET SUITE 350			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105			1634	
			DATE MAILED: 10/16/2003	3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/976,423	HOGAN, KIRK
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Jeanine A Goldberg	1634
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 08 September 2003 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment which	ation. A proper reply to a
PERIOD FOR RE	<u>:PLY</u> [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire is ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CFI	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension
fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Offic timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	the shortened statutory period for reply on the later than three months after the mail (FR 1.704(b).	originally set in the final Office action; or ing date of the final rejection, even if
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:	
(a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (s	see NOTE below);
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•	
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or simplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancelling NOTE:	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		eparate, timely filed amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☑ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.		o issues which were newly
 For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we 	· , ,	
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed: <u>NONE</u> .		
Claim(s) objected to: <u>NONE</u> .		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>45-68 and 71</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: 69 and 70.		•
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	
10. Other:	Mo	
	JEFFREY FREDMAN PRIMARY EXAMINER	G. Holdberg

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:

All of the arguments are directed to the newly amended claims. To the extent that the claims have not been entered, the arguments are moot. The response argues that the claims are not anticipated. The response asserts the examiner's arguments are conclusory and unsupported by case law or the MPEP. The rejection of record cites both the MPEP and case law on number occassions (see pages 9-11, for example). The response asserts that the intended use which is recited on the instructions with printed instructions for use. This argument has been thoroughly addressed in the final rejection. The third reason the response traverses is that the instructions both chemically and physically affect the chemical nature of the components of the kit. The final rejection also has thoroughly responded to this arguments. Fourth, the response again asserts there is no case law or MPEP citation which is relevant such that the examiner has made up and does not comport with the law. Applicant is respectfully requested to read In re Gulack.

With respect to the declaration filed under 1.132, the MPEP states, 716.01 Generally Applicable Criteria The following criteria are applicable to all evidence traversing rejections submitted by applicants, including affidavits or declarations submitted under 37 CFR 1.132:(A) Timeliness. Evidence traversing rejections must be timely or seasonably filed to be entered and entitled to consideration. In re Rothermel, 276 F.2d 393, 125 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1960). Affidavits and declarations submitted under 37 CFR 1.132 and other evidence traversing rejections are considered timely if submitted:

prior to a final rejection,

(2) before appeal in an application not having a final rejection, or

(3) after final rejection and submitted

- (i) with a first reply after final rejection for the purpose of overcoming a new ground of rejection or requirement made in the final rejection, or
- (ii) with a satisfactory showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) or 37 CFR 1.195, or

(iii) under 37 CFR 1.129(a).

The declaration has been filed after a final rejection and does not address a new ground of rejection. Further there is no satisfactory showing under 1.116(b) or 1.195, therefore, the declaration has not been considered.

Ud brief if